DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 966 HE 022 975

AUTHOR Carbone, Robert F.
TITLE Fund Raising as a Profession.
INSTITUTION Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising, College Park, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 60p.
AVAILABLE FROM Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising, 3112 Benjamin Building, University of Maryland College Park, College Park, MD 20742 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; *Finance Occupations; *Fund Raising; Higher Education; *Professional Development; Professional Recognition

ABSTRACT

The monograph reports on a survey of fund raiser attitudes toward issues of professionalism and stresses that professional competence is not enough if an occupational group aspires to be recognized as a true profession. Part I provides an overview of fund raising as a profession including sections on: what a profession is, the professional continuum, semi-professions, professional attitudes, the process approach, the power approach, and the structural-functional approach; Part II reports on demographic data for the 754 fund raisers surveyed including the type of institution they represented (e.g., 41% college/university/school), educational level, gender, and age. The attitude of fund raisers toward many aspects of their work is reported including fund raiser attitudes toward each of the following six characteristics of professionalism: autonomy of decision making, a systematic body of knowledge and skills, self-regulation and collegial standard setting, commitment to and identification with the profession, altruism and dedication to service, and a code of ethics with accompanying sanctions. Part III, a summary, concludes that although fund raising is not yet a profession it has the potential to attain greater professional stature. Three appendices provide details on the study's methodology, the survey instrument; and responses of the fund raisers to forced-choice items. Contains 30 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED314966

Fund Raising as a Profession

By Robert E. Carbone

HE 022 975

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Carbone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

Fund Raising as a Profession

By **Robert F. Carbone**

Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising
3112 Benjamin Building
The University of Maryland College Park
College Park, MD 20742

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR RESEARCH ON FUND RAISING

The Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising, created in 1985, is an organization concerned with the study of fund raising in colleges, universities, and other nonprofit organizations. Its major purposes are:

- Stimulating research on fund raising in a wide variety of academic disciplines and professional fields;
- Conducting research studies on fund raising and on practitioners of the fund raising art;
- Publishing reports of research conducted under auspice of the Clearinghouse;
- Collecting research reports on fund raising, fund raisers, institutional advancement, philanthropy, and voluntarism;
- Assisting graduate students who conduct research on these and related topics.

In addition to this monograph, the Clearinghouse has published:

- *An Agenda for Research on Fund Raising* by Robert F. Carbone, 1985, 40 pages ($5 prepaid, $6 invoiced);
- *Fund Raisers of Academe* by Robert F. Carbone, 1987, 19 pages ($5 prepaid, $6 invoiced).

Inquiries and publication orders should be addressed to

Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising
Robert F. Carbone, Director
3112 Benjamin
University of Maryland College Park
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 454–5766

Contents

Acknowledgements 5
Foreword 7

Part I
Fund Raising as a Profession

Just What is a Profession, Anyway? 9
Going Around in Circles 10
The Professional Continuum 11
More on Semi-Professions 13
Professional Attitudes 13
The Process Approach 14
The Power Approach 16
The Structural-Functional Approach 17

Part II
What Fund Raisers Think About Their Professional Status

Nonprofit Sector Fund Raisers 23
Professional Characteristics 27
Autonomy of Decision Making 27
A Systematic Body of Knowledge and Skills 29
Self-regulation and Collegial Standard Setting 32
Commitment to and Identification with the Profession 34
Altruism and Dedication to Service 38
A Code of Ethics with Accompanying Sanctions. 40

Part III
Fund Raising As A Profession Revisited 43

Bibliography 47
Appendix A Methodology of the Study 49
Appendix B Survey Instrument 53
Appendix C Responses of Fund Raisers
to Forced-choice Items 57

[Professionals] . . . profess to know better than others the nature of certain matters, and to know better than their clients what ails them or their affairs.

—Everett C. Hughes

Acknowledgements

Studies such as the one reported here are seldom produced without the assistance and encouragement of many people. While the author may lay claim to an original idea, the final product reflects molding and shaping by others who touched it along the way. Each individual mentioned here deserves recognition for helping to move this study of professional development in fund raising from idea to reality.

It was the interest and support of Charles A. Johnson, Vice President for Development at the Lilly Endowment, Inc., that initially made this project possible. His efforts to encourage scholarship on philanthropy and related topics, of which this study is but a modest example, are widely recognized and greatly appreciated.

Executive officers of three major organizations of fund raisers facilitated collection of data on which this report is based. They are the late J. Richard Wilson, and subsequently his successor Gail Clarke, of the National Society of Fund Raising Executives; Gary H. Quehl of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education; and, William C. McGinly of the National Association for Hospital Development. A project advisory committee, one member of which was designated by each of these association executives, was of considerable help. Its members include Stacy O'Connor of NSFRE, Judy Grace of CASE, and Elizabeth Martini of NAHD.

Without the cooperation of a professor's academic department, research projects often languish, and thus I am grateful for the encouragement of Donald R. Warren, Chairman of the Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration at the University of Maryland College Park. Valuable advice was contributed by Robert L. Payton, Executive Director of the Indiana Center on Philanthropy and by James R. Wood, Chairman of the Department of Sociology, Indiana University in Bloomington.

George Ritzer, Department of Sociology, and Kathryn M. Bartol, College of Business and Management, both at the University of Maryland College Park offered helpful suggestions regarding the survey instrument. Furthermore, I drew heavily on Professor Ritzer's published insights about the process of professionalization. Valuable technical assistance was provided also by the University of Maryland Survey Research Center staff. Editorial advice was provided by Barbara Holland and Hyun Yang contributed her excellent word processing skills. Finally, James B. Donnelly, graphic designer in the University's Educational Technology Center, must

be recognized for his desktop publishing talents, of which this monograph is an example.

Thanks is due to each individual and organization listed above and to the more than 750 fund raisers who responded to the survey. As is always the case, of course, the author must take full responsibility for all that is written in this monograph. It is my pleasure to do so.

Robert F. Carbone
College Park, MD
September 1989

Funds for preparation of this monograph were provided by the Lilly Endowment, Inc.
© 1989 by Robert F. Carbone

Foreword

Even a quick glance through conference programs for regional and national associations to which fund raisers belong reveals an interesting phenomenon. Virtually all of the sessions—speeches, seminars, panels, roundtables, job-alike discussions, and so on—are concerned with one theme: How to do your job better.

Similarly, the mail of fund raisers (and even those of us who are not practitioners of the art) is filled with flashy invitations to a wide variety of "how to" seminars offered by associations and by a host of private entrepreneurs and nonprofit organizations. There can be little doubt that practitioners who seek to sharpen their skills have a varied menu from which to select.

This plethora of educational opportunities on how to do your job better is the primary reason this monograph was written. Competence in the workplace is obviously an important concern of practitioners in any occupation.

If, however, an occupational group aspires to be recognized as a "true profession," competence cannot be its predominant concern. The brief and admittedly provocative thesis of this monograph is: COMPETENCE IS NOT ENOUGH!

Attainment of professional stature requires a level of bearing or comportment involving both behavior and attitudes that rise above merely doing a job in a competent manner. There is, to be sure, admirable concern about professionalism among fund raisers that finds expression in publications and presentations. As will be clear from the pages that follow, such concern is in itself evidence of movement toward professional stature. It reflects genuine advances beyond suggestions for professional development expressed by the fund raisers a decade ago.

Articles from association journals of the 1970's reveal a somewhat more basic level of thinking about professional development of that era. For obvious reasons, authors and references to their articles are not provided here. One writer called for a national institute on "fund-raising management," patterned after a similar organization for bankers. Another suggested a self-study approach involving needs assessment, identification of resources, and a personal time allocation plan. A third suggested a laundry list of characteristics "we ought to share in order to claim professional respect." It included working hard (but not so hard as to reduce effective-

ness), resourcefulness, resiliency, personal perspective that avoids "messianic feelings," a sense of humor, assertiveness, confidence, respect for "academic principles and institutions," and finally mastery of a body of knowledge.

Clearly practitioners of the fund raising art have advanced beyond this level, but there is yet much to be done. The somewhat single-minded attention to expertise on the job suggests that many fund raisers have only a rudimentary understanding of what is involved in professionalism and in attainment of stature as a true profession.

Expansion of understanding about professions, professionalism, and the process of professionalization is the purpose of this monograph. Teaching, as really creative teachers demonstrate, is much more than telling. Yet, telling may be an important first step in learning. It is learning—in this case, learning about professions—that is the desired end-product of what is told here.

Part I

Fund Raising as a Profession

The words "profession" or "professional" creep into the everyday language of just about everyone. As is often the case, overuse of a word correlates highly with the loss of its real meaning.

"What's your profession?" asks the nice lady sitting next to you on an airplane. She really wants to know what work you do. Much is written about "professional" fullbacks and prizefighters; there are "professional" truck drivers and gamblers (and schools that claim to train these pros). What makes these people "professional?"

Recently the Professional Picture Framers Association placed an ad in the Washington Post seeking candidates for the position of executive director. (Candidates should send resumes to 18140 Mack Avenue, Grosse Pointe, Michigan.) Are there really "professional" behaviors associated with framing pictures?

What people are talking and writing about, of course, are vocations or occupations. Everyone knows what these words mean, but using them to modify the proper name of the work somebody does is awkward. Who would want to say, "I'm an occupational house painter," or "There goes a vocational barber?" Besides, using the term "professional" adds a note of class to the occupation, because we all know that professions enjoy prestige, approbation, and public recognition. Fund raisers, no less than those in other fields of work, often speak of "the profession." A favorite phrase in many fund raising seminars is, "As professionals, we must..." When asked in a survey what could be done to help fund raising resemble more closely the "true professions," one respondent wrote, "It already is, so why worry about it?" Why, indeed?

Just What Is A Profession, Anyway?

Nobody seems to know exactly—not even the scholars who study and write about professions. Perhaps it is more accurate to assert that there are many answers, each depending on the criteria used in formulating a definition. An author in England (Goodlad, 1984, p. 5) when asked this same question, cited "...the notorious difficulty in defining a profession," and moved on to another topic. He is in good company.

A respected U.S. scholar claims, "...it is not as easy to define what

constitutes a profession as one might at first assume." The model to which many occupational fields aspire can be described, he says, "...but it rarely applies in practice and is itself shifting." (Schein, 1972, p. 14) Other students of the profession are less cautious, but more wordy. One examined 19th century views and wrote:

> As commonly understood, a profession was a full-time occupation in which a person earned the principle source of income. During a fairly difficult and time-consuming process, a person mastered an esoteric but useful body of systematic knowledge, completed theoretical training before entering a practice or apprenticeship, and received a degree or license from a recognized institution. A professional person in the role of a practitioner insisted upon technical competence, superior skill, and a high quality performance. Moreover, a professional embraced an ethic of service which taught that dedication to a client's interest took precedence over personal profit, when the two happened to come into conflict. (Bledstein, 1976, p. 86)

In contrast to this lengthy definition, Hughes (1963, p. 657) provides one that is much more succinct. He offers "credat emptor (let the buyer trust)," which has added meaning when you consider the antithesis, caveat emptor (let the buyer beware). This actually builds on the longer definition, for it demands that there be a bond of trust between the client and the trained, certified, competent, altruistic professional. Most of us acknowledge this bond because we do what our doctors and lawyers, and sometimes even what our clergy and professors, tell us to do.

According to Bledstein, this bond of trust developed in the 19th century as knowledge expanded, access to information increased, and the world was rocked with a series of crises. "An alarmed society," he asserts "began placing its faith in professional persons." Thus: In Mid-Victorian America, the citizen became a client whose obligation was to trust the professional. Legitimate authority now resided in special spaces, like the courtroom, the classroom, and the hospital; and it resided in special words shared only by experts. (p. 78–79)

Going Around In Circles

In recent years, scholars have all but given up trying to phrase a basic definition of profession, probably because such attempts often lead to

arguments with their colleagues. The modern approach, gleaned from a number of authors (see especially Vollmer and Mills, 1966; Ritzer and Walczak, 1986), tends to make the reader a bit dizzy. It goes something like this:

- Profession—an occupation in which practitioners exhibit certain characteristics associated with professionalism;
- Professionalism—a set of attitudes and behaviors that have come to be seen as characteristics of a "true profession;"
- Professionalization—movement along a continuum toward correspondence with some accepted model of a profession;
- Deprofessionalization—movement away from conformity with the accepted model of a profession.

While this may be a bit confusing, it does introduce a useful notion—the concept of a continuum along which occupations travel, propelled by social and economic conditions, as well as by the actions of members.

The Professional Continuum

Much disagreement about what qualifies as a profession stems from attempts to sort occupations into two categories—professions and nonprofessions. More light and less heat is generated by asking how closely any given occupation resembles those which enjoy public recognition as so-called "true professions." In other words, to what degree do the attitudes and behaviors of practitioners of occupation X (professional status unclear) conform to occupations Y and Z (professional status established)? It is helpful to envision this as a continuum,

Deprofessionalization ⟵⟶ Professionalization

along which any occupation can be charted depending on the characteristics it exhibits.

As might be suspected, however, charting occupations along the continuum is not a simple task because there are different classes of occupations. Let us, for the moment at least, designate all occupations as professions but agree that each one exhibits a somewhat different set of professionalizing characteristics. Using a system suggested by Albert Reiss (see Ritzer and Walczak, 1988, p.63), they can be identified in this manner:

- Old established professions whose members are physicians, lawyers, professors, and clergy;
- New professions whose members are engineers, computer scientists, psychologists, and similar professionals;

- Semi-professions whose members are school teachers, nurses, social workers, and librarians, to name but a few.

An additional set of categories for classifying some occupations (professions) consists of:

- Would-be professions whose members include personnel managers, insurance agents, funeral directors, and similar workers;
- Marginal professions whose members include laboratory technicians, legal assistants, and other paraprofessionals;
- Declining professions whose members are most likely to be found among the old established professions (for example, the clergy, whose aura of authority and respect appears to diminish in an increasingly scientific, secularized, and materialistic society).

This latter category, of course, illustrates the risk of deprofessionalization that all professions face. (See Ritzer and Walczak, 1988, p. 1–22) Criticism of professionals accompanies increased educational levels of the general population, as people begin to question the "legitimate authority" of experts. When the bond of trust between client and professional is weakened, the profession loses stature. Columnist Michael Barone (1983) provides some evidence of deprofessionalization. He claims the U.S. has 15 times more lawyers per capita than does Japan, and says, "...the legal profession is absorbing too many of our best brains and using them in economically unproductive ways." He quotes Robert Reich who calls attorneys "paper entrepreneurs...who partake of the wealth others produce." And, of course, except when we need them, many of us express a degree of disdain for barristers.

Sometimes professionals criticize their own kind. The head of a famous cancer research center asserts doctors today are "...too impersonal, too interested in symptoms and not interested enough in human beings," Barone writes. Skeptics now refer to "McDoctors" or "Doctors In A Box," meaning physicians who operate out of store-front, walk-in offices. If executives in the business world qualify as professionals, they suffer loss of authority also. Two Harvard professors, says Barone, call corporate moguls, "...the chief culprits in the nation's decline in productivity [because] they concentrate on improving short-term financial performance rather than building long-term productive capacity." It is clear that the professional continuum is a two-way street. If old established professions can experience a degree of deprofessionalization, so too can those new, semi-, would-be,

marginal professions now striving to take their places among the vocations most highly recognized and honored by society.

More On Semi-Professions

Before moving to discussion of the professionalizing process, a further look at semi-professions is warranted. A collaborative examination of these occupations, edited by Etzioni (1969) suggests why their claim to the status of doctors and lawyers is not fully established. Training in these fields is shorter, they are "less legitimated," their rights to "privileged communications" are less well established, they rely on a less specialized body of knowledge, and they have less autonomy from supervision or societal control. Etzioni asserts in the preface of this book that these "middle-status groups" should work to improve their status as semi-professions rather than strive for true professional status. There is, he claims, "...a distinct middle ground" from which semi-professions cannot move since they do not possess "the authority of knowledge" required to do so. Why? Etzioni says it is because semi-professionals rarely deal with life or death matters and also because their decisions are more subject to the authority of administrators or to that of other professionals. Goode (in Etzioni, 1969) discusses the "theoretical limits of professionalization" and agrees that many occupations aspiring to professional status will have difficulty attaining it. He attributes this to lower commitment to norms of service, fewer members remaining in the profession throughout their lifetimes, and less control over professional decisions and over members who violate established norms of behavior.

These points illustrate what semi-professions must do to move along the professional continuum. It is to that topic that this discussion of fund raising as a profession now moves.

Professional Attitudes

A refined sense of professionalism among its practitioners is perhaps the most lofty benefit an occupation acquires as it moves forward on the professional continuum. There are, of course, other less noble rewards: greater prestige, increased remuneration, and what some observers call psychic income. Undoubtedly though, the primary motivation in any quest for professional stature is a desire to instill in practitioners a set of attitudes that promote high quality professional behavior.

An example of these affective elements is proposed by three researchers (Kerr, Von Glinow, and Schriesheim, 1977) who studied scientists and engineers. True professionals, they say, exhibit:

- desire for professional autonomy;
- commitment to the profession;
- identification with the profession;
- adherence to a code of professional ethics; and,
- belief in collegial maintenance of standards.

These traits, often stated in slightly different language, tend to appear in the writings of nearly every scholar who examines professions and professional behavior.

The Process Approach

One approach to understanding professionals is identification of the steps that an occupation takes in the professionalization process. Wilensky (1964), in an article titled "The Professionalization of Everyone," defines the stages through which an occupation passes on its way to gaining public recognition as a profession. Initially, he asserts, the work must become a full-time occupation. This point has considerable significance for fund raising since many small nonprofit organizations still employ part-time development officers and even some larger ones assign full-time employees multiple tasks, only one of which involves raising money. Furthermore, virtually all development units rely on volunteers—who are, in fact, part time, amateur (viz., not professional) fund raisers—to assist in garnering private gifts.

A second stage in the process is establishment of special schools for training new members of the group. This, according to Wilensky, requires identification of a substantial knowledge base and ultimately affiliation with established institutions of higher education. University-based professional schools appeared for most of the so-called "true professions" in the 1860s and 70s and by 1894 formal examination and licensure systems for these fields were mandated by 21 states, while only graduates of accredited medical schools could practice in 14 other states. (Bledstein, 1976)

Creation of academic courses for aspiring fund raisers, to say nothing of complete degree programs (most of which are in nonprofit organization management with only some attention to fund raising) is a recent trend in this country. Overseas formal study of these matters is virtually unknown. Establishment of degree programs and several centers for study of philanthropy—Indiana University, Duke, and City University of New York Graduate Center, to name but a few—is a promising advance in professionalization of fund raising.

Wilensky's third stage is formation of a professional association for

members of the occupational group. This often involves changing the title that identifies the work members do, specifying more clearly the exact nature of their tasks, and creating some mechanism for eliminating practitioners who are incompetent. Societies related to the "true profession" are largely a 19th century phenomenon also, according to Bledstein.

Fund raisers can choose from a variety of professional associations, notably the three whose cooperation made this project possible. A recent addition to this array of organizations is one for prospect researchers. While each of these several associations clearly exerts professionalizing influences, the absence of a single, unified professional referent group may, in fact, be a countervailing force which slows movement toward greater professional stature.

On the other hand, the adoption of different titles—CASE likes "institutional advancement;" NSFRE prefers "fund raising executive;" and NAHD favors "development" rather than fund raising—provides evidence that this stage of the professionalization process is being addressed, but is unresolved at this time. Unfortunately, elimination of incompetent practitioners in the field does not appear to be among the priorities of these membership organizations.

The fourth stage of professionalization, according to Wilensky, is formulation of a code of ethics which defines relationships between practitioners and clients, as well as appropriate relationships among colleagues. Ideally, he says, this leads to legal recognition of the profession and provides formal protection of its members' right to practice and of the profession's place in society.

Since fund raising has an abundance of professional associations to which practitioners may belong, it has a corresponding abundance of ethical codes. Each of them addresses some core ethical issues, although the language of each differs, as does the total content. It is not clear that the lack of a common set of ethical standards to which all fund raising practitioners might subscribe retards professionalization. As is often true in public affairs, however, a unified position representing a broad constituency is effective in achieving recognition by legislative bodies and by society in general. Absence of a single ethical code for fund raisers is a matter to which association leaders might give some further attention.

An additional consideration with regard to ethical codes is the presence or absence of sanctions which might be applied to practitioners who fail to observe the standards. Clearly sanctions in well established profes-

sions—disbarment or loss of license—while infrequently applied (Schmidt, 1988), enhances professional stature. Interestingly, Wilensky fails to mention sanctions, although other students of the professionalization process do cite the importance of enforcement techniques.

A slightly more elaborate set of professionalizing steps, offered by Ritzer and Walczak, adds a final item to the list. They cite organized political effort by practitioners, usually through their associations, to achieve both legal and popular recognition of their occupation as a profession. As the next section makes clear, success of lobbying and public relations efforts can greatly accelerate the professionalization process.

The Power Approach

Moving through stages such as those mentioned in the previous section is an evolutionary process leading to professional recognition. A more revolutionary method, described by Ritzer and Walczak, is called the power approach. With no apology for the note of cynicism, they assert:

> Where an occupation lies on the professional continuum depends on how much power it possesses and whether...it has been able to acquire, or to convince significant others that it has acquired, a high degree...of professional characteristics. (p. 65)

The intent, of course, is to persuade society that the occupation closely resembles widely recognized professions. Using the power it possesses, the occupation creates the characteristics that distinguish true professions, or at least makes sure it appears to possess those characteristics. Next it gains *de jure* or *de facto* authority in the form of a government charter or by virtue of a tradition widely accepted by society in general. If either the charter or tradition are in place, the occupation wins exclusive rights and privileges for its members; that is, rights and privileges not available to any other group in society.

How can this level of power be achieved? Ritzer and Walczak say it requires "gaining control of the market." Society is led to believe the services of this occupational group are necessary, even essential. Next, entrance to the occupation is controlled. Finally, means are developed to insure that the group's work is not routinized; that is, not reduced to a series of steps large numbers of people may easily learn.

Only one of these conditions currently pertains, even in a limited sense, to the field of fund raising. The necessity of effective fund raising to

support organizations in the nonprofit sector is now widely recognized, fueled in no small way by supply-side economics. No one has control over who enters the field, however, and many techniques used by fund raisers can be rather easily learned by amateurs—volunteers and even paid student callers who staff telethons. Given all this, the power approach does not appear to be a promising alternative for those interested in advancing the professional stature of fund raising.

The Structural-Functional Approach

This third approach to professionalization appears more appropriate for occupations without power sufficient to persuade society of their professional stature, or without the momentum necessary to overcome impediments that slow movement through evolutionary stages of professional advancement. In many ways, fund raising is an occupation that suffers from these limitations. Fund raising still has many part-time practitioners, few recognized training schools, no overarching and unified professional society, no single code of ethics that covers all members, and limited power to mount convincing political and public relations efforts to enhance its status. On the other hand, existing associations of fund raisers could cooperatively examine and strengthen certain aspects of the field in a manner that might accelerate professionalization.

The following discussion of these six structural and functional elements, draws heavily on the work of Ritzer and Walczak. Comments about each element address its applicability to fund raising and the degree to which recognized professions exhibit the characteristic.

Theoretical Knowledge. Practice in any true profession is based on a body of knowledge and a set of skills that have some rational foundation. This means that knowledge and skills employed by practitioners are not gained primarily through practical experience. Greenwood's article (1957), "Attributes of a Profession," asserts:

> The crucial distinction between professions and nonprofessions is this: the skills that characterize a profession flow from and are supported by a fund of knowledge that has been organized into an internally consistent system called a body of theory. (p. 46)

Therefore, content basic to a profession can be transmitted through formal instruction in a setting removed from the workplace. Normally an opportunity to test theoretical knowledge in practice follows an extended

period of formal instruction. Upon these notions rests the rationale for creation of specialized training schools for each professional group.

Occupations lacking professional status ("nonprofessions," as Greenwood calls them) are not necessarily devoid of theoretical underpinnings. The work of electricians, for example, is based on certain physical principles. Since their training is heavily experiential, however, many electricians do not possess a sophisticated understanding of theoretical concepts behind their everyday operations.

Until recently, fund raising knowledge and skill was gained almost exclusively through on-the-job experiences. Efforts to build a more substantial body of principles (dare we yet call them theories?) are gaining momentum, due in large measure to leadership by Independent Sector and to a lesser extent by the several associations of fund raisers. As its knowledge base continues to grow and as more formal training schools develop, fund raising begins to resemble more closely professions that enjoy widespread public recognition and approval.

Freedom From External Control. Professionals enjoy a high degree of autonomy; they have the "bottom line" on most, if not all, matters relating to their practice. This element amounts to a license to control their own activities. In theory at least, collectively they select new members of the profession, decide how these new members will be trained, create codes that define acceptable and unacceptable practice, and exercise sanctions over members who engage in unprofessional behavior.

The discerning reader perceives, no doubt, that this description of professional autonomy is highly idealized. As Ritzer and Walczak contend:

> Professions have never been as autonomous as they would like us to believe, do not really require the autonomy, and often use it to the detriment of clients and the public. (p. 73)

Self-employed professionals who practice with few if any immediate colleagues may still operate without restriction of decision making, but their numbers continue to diminish. Those engaged in group practice or professionals associated with an organization (e.g., a hospital, HMO, large law firm, denomination, educational institution) regularly relinquish some freedom and conform to group judgement, institutional rules, or administrative fiat. Fund raisers—except those who stand hat in hand on the street—work for organizations and thus constantly deal with the autonomy issue. It is likely that the degree of autonomy they enjoy is directly related to their prominence in organizational policy making. As distance from the policy

making group or individual increases, autonomy diminishes.

Commitment To Service. An occupation—profession, if you prefer—was once commonly known as a "calling." Used mainly in connection with clergy, the term means "a strong inner impulse toward a particular course of action especially when accompanied by conviction of divine influence." Scholars who study professions tend to consider this simply as altruism or a sense of service to clients and the community as opposed to advancing selfinterests. Ritzer and Walczak call it "interest in symbolic rather than economic rewards." (p. 74)

It is uncommon today, at least in the more sophisticated segments of society, to believe in the notion of being "called" to a given occupation, even the ministry. And few people will admit, without at least a slight wink, that self-interest does not play a major role in making career decisions. While pure altruism may be something of a myth, there remains among professionals the expectation of service to clients and society.

Evidence of altruistic behavior of professionals is not difficult to find. Physicians return calls late on Sunday evenings when a child's fever is high; lawyers take cases pro bono; journalists go to jail rather than divulge a source; professors read poorly written dissertations instead of writing a textbook that would yield royalties; fund raisers stick with struggling nonprofit organizations because they believe in the cause for which they seek support.

The other side of the coin (if the metaphor can be slightly overworked) is clearly evident in professional ranks as well. No examples of rampant self-interest among professionals need be cited to make the point. Clearly self-interest and economic considerations do operate, both in decisions about selecting an occupation and in professional behavior once the professional enters practice.

Authority Over Clients. Unlike transactions in the world of commerce, where ostensibly "the customer is always right," professional interaction with clients is based on exactly the opposite premise. Professionals assume that clients are not able to assess their own needs with regard to situations at hand. Neither do clients possess the skills and knowledge to satisfy those needs.

These assumptions derive from the "authority of knowledge" concept discussed earlier, which distinguishes trained and competent practitioners from members of society who require their services. Professional authority depends also on the "bond of trust" between practitioner and client and on

professional "control of the market" which prevents others from offering the needed service.

Authority, however, may be eroded by changing conditions. Sophisticated clients increasingly question decisions of professionals they consult; sick people seek second opinions; publications that teach laymen how to draft wills and other legal documents are readily available; consumer protection laws restrict professional authority; non-profit organizations disregard the advice of their fund raising consultant; people simply fire the professional and find another.

In fund raising, authority over clients is illusory at best. Organizations that employ fund raisers might be considered clients, but they are unlikely to relinquish authority over important decisions. If the client is a prospective donor who the fund raiser is advising on a planned gift, for example, it is clear where the final authority resides. Authority of fund raisers appears to depend as much on their ability to persuade as it does on the strength of their specialized knowledge and skills, principally because they do not deal with life or death matters. This makes the road to professional recognition a more difficult one to travel.

A Distinctive Occupational Culture. As an occupation moves toward greater professional stature, it can become a unique sub-culture of the larger society. Elements of this occupational sub-culture include both tangible and intangible indicators of the group's special nature. Formal associations of members plus specialized sub-groupings emerge; specialized training schools for preparation of new members add to the culture; journals, newsletters, and other publications bind the group together and transmit information that contributes to group cohesion; informal clusters of members begin to form around both social and professional situations.

Attitudes of members and common ways of thinking about their work and their occupation constitute the more intangible elements. Certain values emerge governing service, authority, and objectivity; norms are established controlling entry to the profession and the relationship between members and clients; symbols of the profession appear in the form of distinctive argot, articles of clothing, forms of address; and, there emerges a folklore of the field complete with heroic tales and stories of arcane practices long since rejected by its members.

Many of these artifacts are already in place in the sub-culture of fund raisers, a sure sign of professional advancement. It must be remembered, however, that many occupational groups not recognized as professions exhibit distinctive sub-cultural characteristics. Evidence of this can be

observed, for example, at conventions of funeral directors or meetings of any pipe fitters union local.

Recognition By Society. A final element—recognition by society that the occupation is indeed a profession—is of paramount importance. Normally this involves more than mere widespread acceptance by the general public. Recognition by legal authority, while not absolutely necessary, certainly places the occupational group in a position of strength from which it is not likely to be dislodged. The benefit, of course, is exclusive rights to practice and protection of its members from virtually all external authority.

Formal acceptance and recognition is undoubtedly the overriding consideration in professionalization since it means society acknowledges that practitioners of the occupation exhibit the other five elements discussed above. Whether or not members actually possess these elements is somewhat beside the point, although public recognition is rarely attained without the perception that the other five are present.

While a measure of understanding and public acceptance of the role of fund raisers is evident, legal recognition of fund raising as a profession is another matter. Legislative initiatives in the past have been designed to control rather than to emancipate fund raisers. Greater professional cohesion and self-regulation by fund raising practitioners could well reverse that trend or at least help move the occupation closer to some modified form of legal protection.

****

Thus far this discussion has been about professions in general and only incidentally about fund raising as an occupation seeking its rightful place on the professional continuum. An understanding of professions, their identifying characteristics, and of the process of professionalization provides, it is hoped, a basis for interpreting what is reported in the section that follows.

Part II of this monograph focuses specifically on fund raisers and the work they do. Data supplied by a large sample of fund raisers from all types of nonprofit organizations is used to present an interesting and sometimes surprising picture—often in their own words—of an important but not well understood group of American workers.

Fund raising is a long series of miserable failures followed by a few brilliant successes . . . all of which were accidental.

—Anonymous

Part II

What Fund Raisers Think about Their Professional Status

Fund raising, when viewed through prisms crafted by scholars who study professions, presents a set of slightly blurred images, as Part I of this monograph reveals. Perhaps these images can be sharpened by examining how fund raisers view themselves, their colleagues and their occupation. The pages that follow document these views in terms of six elements assumed to be characteristics of professions or, at least, to be associated with the professionalization process.

Evidence of how fund raisers think about their professional status was obtained through a survey of practitioners. (See Appendix A for details on the methods employed.) A replica of the survey instrument used to collect these data is found in Appendix B. The survey was sent to 1,750 fund raisers representing three national associations of fund raisers and 754 of them responded. While each of the associations collects data on its members, no previous survey could be found that provides a description of such a broad spectrum of fund raisers associated with nonprofit organizations in this country.

Nonprofit Sector Fund Raisers

A profile of the 754 fund raisers who returned usable copies of the survey instrument reveals interesting information about nonprofit sector fund raisers, the kinds of institutions and organizations for which they work, their backgrounds, and other demographic factors. In general, these fund raisers do not differ markedly from those described in earlier studies. (Carbone, 1987; NSFRE, 1988)

The percent of fund raisers employed by various types of institutions and organizations is,

- 41% – college/university/school
- 25% – medical/health care organization
- 13% – social service organization
- 5% – cultural arts organization
- 3% – religious organization
- 13% – all other organizations.

Given the number of nonprofit organizations in the U.S. that are not academic institutions, the proportion of fund raisers in this sample who are employed by colleges, universities, and schools appears to be high. Academic fund raisers appear to be more willing to participate in surveys such as the one that yielded these data. Or, perhaps the rapid expansion of fund raising units in academe means that these institutions now employ four of every ten fund raisers in the nation. It is not uncommon for large, complex research universities, both public and private, to have 50 to 100 staff members involved in fund raising (or institutional advancement) activities.

This is particularly true in institutions that have decentralized these functions or that are conducting substantial capital campaigns. Many fund raisers, however, work alone or with very few immediate colleagues who do fund raising. For example, among these fund raisers,

- 27% work alone, without other fund raisers
- 39% work with 1 to 3 fund raising colleagues
- 15% work with 4 to 9 colleagues who do fund raising
- 18% work in organizations that employ 10 or more fund raisers.

If it can be assumed that interaction with colleagues engaged in the same occupational pursuits is an important aspect of professional life, this finding is of special significance. Nearly three in ten fund raisers may be compared to the legendary family doctor who ran his office and made his house calls as an independent practitioner. Unlike colleagues engaged in some form of group practice, independent practitioners rarely benefit from the professionalizing influence of daily contact with colleagues. To be sure, local chapters of fund raising associations provide some degree of this important element. Maybe local association sessions and occasional regional or national conferences provide sufficient professional stimulation for fund raisers. With so many fund raisers operating out of one-woman or one-man shops, however, the task of creating a cohesive professional culture with a common set of values and standards is much more difficult.

Another important factor that influences professionalization is the kind and level of formal education achieved by practitioners of any occupation. An earlier study (Carbone, 1987) revealed the wide range of academic majors chosen by persons who later became fund raisers. Furthermore, there are few formal academic programs for preparing fund raisers and those that exist enroll relatively few potential fund raising practitioners. This lack of professional socialization through a formal training program, so evident in fields now recognized as professions, appears to mitigate

against the professionalization of fund raising. Moreover, not even half of the practicing fund raisers described here claim credentials beyond the bachelor's degree. Their educational levels are,

- 6% with only high school diplomas
- 47% have earned bachelor's degrees
- 38% are holders of master's degrees
- 9% earned a doctorate in some field of study.

While advanced degrees do not ensure the road to professional status will be smooth, these data suggest that strong professionalizing influences would have to be present in the work environments of fund raisers to compensate for those provided by formal training programs required by some professional groups. Evidence reported later in this monograph does not confirm the presence of these professionalizing influences.

Other demographic data confirm what is conventional wisdom among fund raising practitioners. Once almost strictly a man's occupation, fund rais ing is now heavily peopled with women practitioners. The gender data are,

- 51% of fund raisers are male
- 49% who work in this field are female.

And, as a group fund raisers are relatively young. As far as age is concerned,

- 7% have not yet reached 30 years of age
- 68% are between 31 and 50 years of age
- 25% have already celebrated their 50th birthday.

No doubt the rapid expansion of fund raising staffs in all types of nonprofit organizations accounts for both the increase in women members and the large number of young members. Women, especially those just entering or those re-entering the work force, may be willing to accept the relatively low entry level salaries that many nonprofits must offer. Or, many younger persons whose academic backgrounds did not prepare them for entry to other occupations may gravitate toward the nonprofit sector where requirements for entry are not well-formed or specified by law or profes-sional societies. Fund raising experience as volunteers, especially in the case of women, may be yet another, more plausible explanation.

Nearly four in ten fund raisers have been volunteer fund raisers for one or more years. The step from no-pay to low-pay for these practitioners may not have been too painful. Furthermore, a substantial number of these fund raisers worked one year or more at part-time fund raising jobs prior to

entering full-time employment. A full-time salary, even if at a modest level, may appeal to entry level applicants currently at partial salaries. All of these factors can be associated with younger, predominantly female aspirants to positions in fund raising offices.

Yet another interesting piece of information about nonprofit organization fund raisers relates to the range of tasks they perform. Apparently most do not specialize in any one fund raising technique. The data show:

- 85% have some involvement in annual fund activities, but only 15% say they devote half or more of their time to annual giving
- 27% have some involvement in seeking major or capital gifts, but only 7% report this requires half-time or more
- 44% give some attention to planned gifts, but only 5% devote at least half-time to this program
- 29% spend some time on corporate or foundation solicitation, but only 6% give at least half-time to this task
- 91% say some of their time is claimed by administrative or other tasks, only 15% find that these tasks take half or more of their time, and only 1% claim to be full-time administrators.

The necessity of being "utility infielders," as they say in baseball, is easy to understand. Recall that more than one quarter of these fund raisers have no other staff members and two-thirds of them have only one to three co-workers. Organizations with one-person or small fund raising units require multi-talented fund raisers if anything resembling a comprehensive fund raising program is to be offered.

Another feature that identifies the population from which these data was elicited is their relatively short tenure as full-time fund raisers. It appears that:

- 21% have up to 3 years experience as full-time fund raisers
- 34% report 5 or fewer years in such jobs
- 20% indicate 6 to 9 years
- 31% have 10 or more years in full-time positions.

Again these data are consistent with previous surveys cited above. This composite picture of nonprofit organization fund raisers is, at best, only a snapshot taken in early 1989. By the time you read these pages, of course, the picture will change somewhat because, as an occupational field, fund raising suffers from (some might say, enjoys) an exceptionally high rate of job mobility. Yet, the basic profile of American fund raisers suggests a field characterized by relatively young workers (if not apprentices, certainly

journeypersons, to use the currently preferred term), increasingly female, with college degrees plus a bit more formal study, working in small "shops," doing a wide variety of fund raising jobs, primarily in educational, health care, or social service organizations.

Professional Characteristics

To gain a more detailed understanding of "the sense of professionalism" of fund raisers, the instrument used in this survey was based on characteristics said to be associated with professional behavior. Six such characteristics were defined by amalgamating elements used in earlier studies of professionalization. They are:

- Autonomy of decision making;
- A systematic body of knowledge and skills;
- Self-regulation and collegial standard setting;
- Commitment to and identification with the profession;
- Altruism and dedication to service; and,
- A code of ethics with accompanying sanctions.

Fund raisers judged statements related to these characteristics by indicating whether they agree or disagree with each statement and by indicating the importance they place on behavior described in each statement. (See Appendix C where these forced-choice responses are reported in tabular form.) Other items in the instrument elicited narrative comments relevant to the statements. These comments are summarized and, in some cases, quoted in the following discussion of responses. Each of the six professional characteristics is addressed separately.

This explication of fund raisers' views on professional behavior provides an estimate of where fund raising might be placed on the professional continuum. Implications of this assessment of fund raising as a profession are discussed in Part III of this monograph.

Autonomy of Decision Making

This characteristic signifies that professionals enjoy freedom from external interference with their own professional judgment regarding identification and achievement of goals and objectives of the profession. Recall, it is alleged that professionals possess "authority of knowledge" granting them exclusive rights to make decisions about needs of clients and how these needs will be satisfied (treated). In theory at least, neither clients nor managers of organizations that employ professionals are competent to make such decisions and therefore must rely on expert judgment of professionals.

Only 20% of fund raisers agree that leaders of their institutions and organizations accept "almost without exception" their judgments and decisions about fund raising matters. Significantly, 59% say it is important for their professional judgments to be accepted and only 8% say it is unimportant. Yet, there exists a disquieting note of uncertainty, because 27% are unsure about whether or not their judgments are being accepted and one-third of fund raisers are not even certain that this is an important consideration. More than half disagree with the assertion that their employers regularly accept their decisions.

When asked about controlling their own worktime and determining their own activities, 54% agree that this occurs, but 25% disagree. Nearly three out of four fund raisers say control over time and activities is important, and only 5% say it is unimportant. Uncertainty appears again here as 20% are unsure if fund raisers control their time and activities, and 22% are not certain it is important.

****

What Fund Raisers Say About Autonomy

> I'm not sure [why fund raisers make frequent job changes], perhaps fund raisers need to have ultimate decision making authority—but board interference or organizational politics prevents it.
>
> —A part-time fund raiser in a one-woman shop

Conceivably autonomy, or rather the lack of it, is a factor of such importance to professionals that itdetermines where they work. If so, is interference with professional decisions related to the high degree of job mobility among fund raisers? Comments of fund raisers suggest it is an important, but not overriding, consideration. Few fund raisers mentioned the word "autonomy" in commenting on frequent job changes by their colleagues. Instead they used codewords that carry similar meaning. "Freedom to be creative" is one such term, and "lack of respect," "little understanding," "no appreciation" by boards and CEO's are other ways of saying that fund raisers often lack decision-making power.

One fund raiser put it this way:

> [The problem is] difference of opinion (with CEO's and board members) about what needs to be done and how to do it.

Far more frequently, however, fund raisers mention utilitarian factors associated with changing jobs. "Burn out," need to "improve salaries," and "lack of a career ladder" are common concerns, but an equally frequent complaint is "unrealistic expectations" and lack of "understanding the appropriate role of development officers." This suggests that the selection of goals and methods used to attain them are imposed on many fund raisers. Even more disquieting are comments relating job change to competence of fund raisers. "The Peter Principal is rampant," claims one veteran, and a relative newcomer is even more explicit: "Many of them are not worth a damn...best to move on to something else." But, in contrast, a few fund raisers see job change as an "opportunity to learn more in new assignments" that afford "personal growth" and "a more favorable climate."

In sum, the relative lack of autonomy is aptly explained by a woman whose ten years of experience prompted this comment:

> In general, organizations tend to have unrealistic expectations of their development professionals; tend to see them as [isolates] who should do their work without commitment from and integration with the rest of the organization...

****

All this evidence portrays fund raisers as reactive rather than proactive, implementors of decisions rather than bottom-line decision makers. This relative lack of autonomy to set goals and determine methods of attaining them raises serious questions about the ability of fund raising to move rapidly along the professional continuum. Resolving doubts about competence of some colleagues may be the initial task to be faced by advocates of faster professionalization.

A Systematic Body of Knowledge and Skills

Preparation to enter professional practice is said to involve an extended period of study leading to mastery of a systematic body of knowledge and a set of skills relevant to practice. The term "systematic" implies that this knowledge base is codified in general principles that give the profession a theoretical foundation. Further, it is assumed that assimilation of this theoretical foundation precedes formal entry to practice.

Two out of three fund raisers agree that knowledge and skills they use

in their work are based on "general principles and theory organized in a systematic way." Even a larger percentage of fund raisers say that this is important, while only 8% say it is unimportant. While many fund raisers recognize the necessity of having a substantial knowledge base to guide practice, there is some division of opinion on this point. Twenty-one percent of fund raisers say they are unsure if general principles and theory about fund raising are used in their work, and 17% flatly disagree that a systematic body of knowledge is at their disposal.

Regarding the training of newly appointed fund raisers, 65% of their colleagues say it is important for them to participate in short seminars, conferences, and special topic sessions at national or regional meetings of their associations. Twenty-seven percent are unsure if it is important or not and 8% say it is unimportant. There are reservations about this, however, since 58% of fund raisers disagree that these sessions are sufficient training for newcomers to the field, and an additional 22% are unsure that preparation of this kind is sufficient. Maybe this can be interpreted as support for more formal preliminary preparation of would-be fund raisers, perhaps even in academic programs. On the other hand, many fund raisers would undoubtedly say that conference sessions and short courses can be sufficient initial preparation providing the newly hired staff person is given good on-the-job training by veterans of the art.

****

What Fund Raisers Say About Training New Members

> To date, it's been professional organizations and their self-designed training programs at conferences, seminars, etc. What's needed now is a curriculum plan assembled by professionals (not academics) to guide these training methods link this curriculum to certification/accreditation.
>
> —An experienced hospital development officer

Opinions of fund raisers about preparing future practitioners range all the way from "baptism by fire" to "graduate degree programs." But, one college annual fund director claims, "There is a natural talent for this type of work and if it is not there, nothing will make a good fund raiser." Another says, "There is no general field...training should be in the specific field (education, religion, health, etc.) by a professional organization or by the employer."

By an overwhelming margin, however, fund raisers say that "mentoring," "hands-on experience," "on-the-job training," "internships," "apprenticeships," and "working with a true professional," coupled with short seminars and conferences is the most effective training scheme. Advocates of more formal preparation in academic institutions are definitely in the minority. Needed is a "combination of on-the-job training and professional seminars; maybe a university course on modern fund raising techniques would be good— but not a degree program," said one college planned giving officer. While there is considerable support for short courses and seminars as suitable training experiences, the cost of these sessions appears to be a problem. A recently appointed fund raiser in the medical field puts it this way:

> I am new...and have no training in this field. The big seminars are too costly and too far away for me to consider attending. However, I would like some training.

Undergraduate courses "in philanthropy and fund raising" are needed according to some fund raisers, perhaps "a college level major" suggested one respondent, and another called for a "master's level curriculum." Several feel formal training and extended continuing education while practicing is the best formula.

A thoughtful summary of these views is offered by this fund raiser in the health care area:

> I would like to see some college level, both undergraduate and graduate level, preparation developed. With this should go...skill assessment and career guidance to en courage only those who are well-suited...to enter the field. Seminars and conferences...are important for those entering the field as well as for those well established in the profession.

****

A significant majority of fund raisers agree that a body of organized knowledge and theory guides their work. There is less agreement, however, on how this knowledge and the skills of fund raising should be transmitted to incoming generations of practitioners. Even some fund raisers who work for academic institutions are far from convinced that formal academic coursework is needed. While short courses and seminars offered by local or

national organizations are considered helpful, most fund raisers think newcomers benefit most from working closely with an experienced practitioner.

Self-regulation and Collegial Standard Setting

Professions are thought to be self-regulating; that is, members of the profession define the rules of professional practice. Members enjoy a high degree of freedom from external control which enables them to specify the nature of professional tasks, how these tasks will be carried out, who enters the profession, and how new members are trained. Furthermore, professionals believe in collegial establishment of standards of practice and in the creation of mechanisms for maintaining these standards.

Self-regulation and the creation of standards governing professional practice is normally a function of professional societies. Fund raisers were asked if their national organizations played a leading role in setting standards and protecting the right to practice. Fifty-six percent of them agree and 62% said this is an important matter. On the other hand, 30% of fund raisers are unsure if their national organizations do this and 14% disagree with the assertion that national organizations play this role. Furthermore, 28% are unsure if it is important and 10% say that it is unimportant for their organizations to do this.

A major element of self-regulation and collegial establishment of standards is peer evaluation of work done by colleagues. Fund raisers were asked to respond to the assertion that their competence and the quality of their work "is best judged primarily by other fund raisers rather than by executives who employ them." Their responses are quite startling.

Only 17% of fund raisers agree that peer judgment is better than permitting organizational executives to make those judgments. The importance of peer judgment is supported by only one-third of fund raisers, while 43% are unsure of its importance and 23% say it is unimportant. A surprising 59% of fund raisers flatly disagree with the assertion that peers are best prepared to judge performance, and 24% of them say they are unsure about this point.

Since peer judgment is so closely tied to self-regulation and collegial concern for standards, it is surprising that so few fund raisers see this as an important part of their work. In all fairness, they may have misinterpreted the statement or mistakenly assumed it merely confirmed that executives who employ do in fact judge their competence and effectiveness. Clearly, the intended meaning was just the opposite.

****

What Fund Raisers Say About Self-regulation

> In the strict sense of the word, I don't think fund raising is yet a profession. To have a profession one must have classes, tests, rites of passage, certification, ritual. Right now, anybody can get a job in development and wear the label "fund raiser..."
> —An NSFRE member who raises funds for a medical organization

Professional status is clearly enhanced if members of the profession exhibit a high degree of self-regulation and enforcement of standards that they establish. Fund raisers surveyed in this study were asked what important things might be done to raise the professional status of fund raising as a field of work. Their responses range far and wide.

A few suggest enforcing "practice standards" and "ethical codes," requiring "competency tests," "increasing the body of knowledge," "eliminating sleazy operators," "peer review," and creation of "one professional organization" with "higher membership requirements." Some think dropping the name "fund raiser and substituting development professional" will help. "Does the professional status need elevating?" asked one college fund raiser, and another proclaimed:

> In my experience it is already a highly professional field and I would vote for less attention to credentials and other artificial measures of attainment.

Others in this camp add, "licensing/certification is not going to gain you more status or respect," and "...the move toward degrees in this field is phony."

These dissenters notwithstanding, the overwhelming majority of respondents say certification or some form of credentialing, accompanied by formal training primarily in degree programs will enhance professional status. Running a close third is creation of public relations and public information programs to educate the public about the good work fund raisers do. "Better pay" came next, followed by programs that recognize "outstanding performance," as well as "mandating continuing education" for practitioners.

A good summary of these diverse opinions is that of a college annual

fund director in her first year of service. She suggests:

> Certification, periodic renewal of license, more...advanced degrees in fund raising and philanthropy through accredited institutions; apprentice periods prior to certification, national testing for certification, and requirement of certification by more [employing] institutions.

****

It seems safe to conclude from these data that self-regulation and establishment of standards by members of the profession is not a deeply ingrained or well-understood concept among fund raisers. Instead there appears to be a tendency in this field to recommend preservice criteria—formal training and certification—as a means of enhancing professional status. These are important elements, of course, as the literature on professionalization confirms. Perhaps they are prerequisite to understanding that collegial definition of rules governing professional practice is of equal, if not greater, importance.

Commitment To and Identification With the Profession

This characteristic means that professionals have a long-term—indeed, perhaps a lifelong—commitment to their work. As committed members of the profession, they identify with it and with its members. Core values of the profession are internalized, its standards are considered inviolate, and members adopt its special vocabulary, titles, forms of address, typical modes of behavior, and sometimes even its unique attire. Members often display symbols of the profession and transmit to their junior colleagues items of professional folklore that help establish its special character.

Commitment and identification are concepts not easily measured, so a more tangible surrogate notion—qualifying for a credential, a certificate, or a license—was substituted. Fund raisers were asked whether their peers would willingly qualify for some type of credential, certificate, or licenses if required to do so. Just over one-third of fund raisers agree, 43% are unsure, and 22% disagree that their peers exhibit a high degree of willingness to qualify for some type of credential or license. To reinforce this view, 20% say qualifying for a credential is unimportant and 37% are unsure of its importance. Forty-three percent expressed the view, however, that it is

important for fund raisers to willingly seek some type of credential.

Using another approach, it was asserted that a credential, certificate, or license indicates commitment and helps elevate the status and recognition afforded fund raising by the general public. Fifty-eight percent of fund raisers agree with this assertion and 54% say it is important. Only 22% disagree and 19% say it is unimportant. About one in five of these fund raisers are unsure if they agree that credentials add status, or if credentials are even important.

A further measure of commitment to and identification with fund raising as an occupational field relates to how practitioners assign their priorities. They were asked to rank the following in order of priority: the institution or organization for which they work, personal success and advancement, and fund raising as a field of work.

Thirty-nine percent place highest priority on personal success, 33% rank the institution or organization as highest, and only 6% said fund raising as a field of work is their highest priority. The other 22% give equally high rank to more than one option.

Another view of these data reveals a similar pattern. Again personal success is given the highest priority by the largest proportion of fund raisers. Their rankings were:

- Personal Success
  - 58% high
  - 32% medium
  - 9% low
  - 1% no rating
- Institution/organization
  - 52% high
  - 35% medium
  - 12% low
  - 1% no rating
- Fund raising as a field
  - 17% high
  - 28% medium
  - 54% low
  - 1% no rating.

****

What Fund Raisers Say About Their Priorities

> Fund raisers, in general, are achievers, hard working, goal-oriented. Even though they care about the causes they serve, they still will look out for number 1.
>
> —A male, ten year veteran, college fund raiser

Personal Success. Fund raisers reveal no lack of opinions about why they rank personal interests above their organizations and above the field of work they have chosen. Here are samples of their comments.

To many, personal success is a natural inclination of fund raisers because they are "goal oriented," "self-starters," "gregarious," and "entrepreneurial" with strong "ego needs" and considerable "pride in personal achievement." Several attributed these priorities to "human nature." "We are no different than other professions," because "First, you must take care of yourself and your family." It's a matter of "survival...we all work to put bread on the table."

Besides, "society values success" and "the money you make," so fund raisers merely "reflect the values of the society in which we live." But if society values money, so do the organizations for which fund raisers work. "Success equals the dollars you raise; that's what we are evaluated on," asserts one fund raiser. Worse yet, it is claimed, "organizations are not loyal to their fund raisers."

These feelings are aptly summed up by the respondent who said:

> Fund raisers must be loyal to themselves first and to the profession second... just like today's corporations, nonprofit institutions exhibit no loyalty to their per sonnel, fund raisers included. So, conversely (and sadly), fund raisers have learned through painful personal experience that loyalty to organizations no longer has meaning in modern American culture...

Organizational Commitment. There are fund raisers, however, whose allegiance to their employing organizations rates highest. "It's part of the natural order," said one, "The organization or cause must be our overriding concern." Another added, "It is hard to ask for money unless you have a genuine commitment to the organization." And yet another said, "I could not be effective and happy raising dollars for every cause; I believe in my organization and its mission."

Fund raisers are "idealistic" and "cause oriented," it is claimed; they

must "believe," be "entirely committed," and "feel strong emotion for the organization," because "it is hard to ask for money unless you have a genuine commitment."

Another fund raiser agreed with these sentiments, but ended with a strange twist. This 12 year veteran, community foundation staffer said:

> One takes a fund raising job because he believes in a cause—not in making money, personal success or the 'thrill of the chase.' As such, the cause becomes all important. A good question would be, "Do you enjoy raising money, or is it a means to advance the cause?' My sense is that most fund raisers don't even like to raise money.

It's the Field That Counts. The minority of respondents who gave top priority to fund raising as a field of work hold equally strong views about their choices. "Pride" and "altruism" are important ingredients, along with the "desire to join a fascinating career field." And one fund raiser thinks, "Some people are just less selfish than others."

Another added a slight ironic note, saying, "We like to feel we make a difference in our communities. However, it may be a case of mental imbalance." This altruistic bent comes through in the comment that, "Without a strong desire to serve, the rewards simply don't have a high enough payout! Although organizations are important, they are not everything..."

Perhaps the most thoughtful comment of all is found in the words of a medical/health care fund raiser with 26 years of experience in the field. He writes:

> To be successful in this profession, you must make a personal commitment to the craft and to the institution or cause you serve. Personal goals, of necessity, end up third. Sacrifice is required.

****

In sum, these data suggest that fund raisers have only limited commitment to and identification with their chosen field of work. While more than half see formal credentials as useful professional symbols, only a third of them say their peers would willingly seek a credential. Further, fund raising as a field appears to be far below personal success and commitment to a cause or an organization in the priorities of fund raisers.

Altruism and Dedication to Service

Members of a profession are thought to be motivated primarily by a desire to serve clients and, in a larger sense, to serve society. This altruistic orientation assigns low priority to self-interest and elevates interests of clients to a much higher priority level. While few professions claim their members are "called" to the work they do, decisions to enter a professional field and daily performance of professional duties reflect a strong sense of selflessness and concern for the welfare of others.

An overwhelming majority of fund raisers express this dedication to service, but as later paragraphs suggest, this response may not reflect their real priorities. Nine out of ten agree that the primary satisfaction felt by their peers stems from a conviction that fund raising benefits people served by institutions and organizations for which they work. Relatively few fund raisers express uncertainty about this conviction and even fewer disagree with it.

If, however, professionals view their work as merely a stepping stone to senior level management positions—which can be seen as another profession—their altruism and dedication to service might be questioned. About one-third of fund raisers agree that their counterparts in nonprofit organizations see fund raising as a way station to higher office. An equal number, however, are uncertain about this, and one fund raiser in four disagrees with this assessment.

On the other hand, one-third of fund raisers think it is important to seek leadership positions, one third are unsure of this, and one in four says it is unimportant. The issue may be somewhat clouded by the fact that senior leadership of an organization almost always involves fund raising and that leadership often provides even greater opportunities to serve society.

****

What Fund Raisers Say About Incentives

> [I would want] variety and challenge in duties, contact with interesting and motivated colleagues and prospects/friends of the organization, good environment, good salary, good future.
>
> —A male academic planned giving officer with a doctorate and 17 years experience

This quote is from a response to a survey question about which incentives would prompt fund raisers to accept a job in another field of work. The elements mentioned are conditions organizational theorists call "hygiene factors"—aspects of work that impinge directly on the worker. Contrasted to these are "motivating factors"—higher order elements that are less utilitarian. In thinking about changing jobs, fund raisers clearly focus on hygiene factors.

This evidence sharply contradicts their almost unanimous agreement that raising money for organizations that benefit society is the major source of satisfaction experienced by their colleagues. When asked about "primary satisfaction" they cite "knowledge that their work benefits people;" when asked about incentives, salary is mentioned five times as often as any other factor. And following salary, fund raisers list "better hours," "better working conditions," "location," "autonomy," "less pressure and stress," and "perks."

On the other hand, a significant number say "greater responsibility" and "challenge" are motivating incentives, and nearly as many say "working for a worthwhile cause" is what would tempt them to take a job elsewhere. Other fund raisers value "an opportunity to make a significant contribution," "providing direct service," and "making a difference."

Relatively few respondents agree with the female university fund raiser who says, "I can't imagine doing anything else." Other such apparently altruistic comments cite "professional growth," "an opportunity to learn more," and "intellectual stimulation." But these notions are clearly less important to the majority of responding fund raisers than are the bread and butter aspects of employment.

Given all this sharply contrasting evidence, and in the interests of fairness, the comment of a female administrator of a relatively large university fund raising organization best summarizes the situation. She concludes that a new position:

> ...would have to be on behalf of an enterprise as important to society as higher education...after that, salary and working conditions/hours would be factors [of importance].

****

Perhaps it was unfair to link the concept of altruism to job satisfaction on one hand and incentives on the other. Yet, it can be argued that

professionals truly devoted to the interests of others (as Webster defines altruism) can be expected to derive satisfaction from their service. Furthermore, it follows that opportunities to be of yet greater service have the potential to outweigh the more utilitarian aspects of employment.

A Code of Ethics With Accompanying Sanctions

Adoption of ethical codes and sanctions against violators is closely related to the notion that professionals enjoy freedom from external control. In exercising this freedom, professionals decide what defines acceptable and unacceptable modes of behavior. Guidance by the profession, in the form of a code of ethics, assists practitioners in conducting their affairs in a manner that brings honor to the profession and thereby helps protect its exclusive rights to practice. These codes provide, in addition, a basis for imposing appropriate punishment on members whose behavior conflicts with accepted norms.

One quarter of fund raisers say their counterparts are not "intimately aware" of ethical codes, nor are they "almost without exception" guided by these codes. Nearly one-half are unsure about this matter and only onethird agree that fund raisers know the codes and follow them. On the other hand, nearly nine out of ten fund raisers say it is important to be aware of ethical standards and to use them as guides, while only one in ten is unsure of how important this is and only one in a hundred finds ethical codes unimportant.

Only 5% of fund raisers agree that there is peer enforcement of ethical standards, 37% are unsure of this, and 58% disagree that enforcement occurs. Importance of peer enforcement is thought to be important by 57%, while 33% are unsure, and 10% say this is unimportant.

****

What Fund Raisers Say About Ethical Code Enforcement

> I hope that at some point our work would be considered important enough that a serious violation would...bar the person from practicing, just as a doctor or lawyer would be barred for a serious violation.
>
> —A female fund raiser with a high school diploma and 12 years of development experience

Asking fund raisers to suggest penalties for serious violations of ethical codes, and how they might be applied, elicited more "I don't know"

responses than did any other item in the survey. Clearly the issue of enforcing ethical codes appears to perplex practitioners. A few say, "It can't be done" and one even thought it is "irrelevant." An eight year veteran of college and university fund raising added:

> I don't believe the fund raising profession can police itself, nor do I believe it should even try. IRS codes and nonprofit corporation law suffice; more regulation and bureaucracy is unwanted and unneeded.

Other fund raisers voice a more positive, if often unrealistic, approach. The two penalties mentioned most often are "public censure" and "exclusion from the field." Many who favor censure suggest this be done through "public notice in newsletters" of national membership organizations, but only a few respondents add "after a hearing before a committee of peers." Establishment of a national clearinghouse for information on scofflaws is the way to accomplish this, according to some fund raisers.

Exclusion from practice is obviously more difficult to implement and suggestions for doing so range from simply, "kick the bastards out," to loss of membership in national organizations, to establishment of a "blacklist." A number of other ideas focus on responsibility of employing institutions and organizations. Violations of ethical standards should result in "termination" and a greater degree of "honesty in writing letters of recommendation." Loss of 501(c)(3) designation, say a few respondents, is the way to force employers to monitor more closely the activities of their fund raisers.

There are fund raisers, however, who favor much milder reaction to ethical lapses. "Peer pressure," "warnings," " demerit points," and "reprimands" are their suggestions. Some say the solution is a matter of "training not punishment" and thus violators should be "retrained and assigned to non-fund raising jobs."

Many NSFRE members suggest that revocation of recognition as a CFRE— Certified Fund Raising Executive—is the proper punishment. As one fund raiser put it, "The unethical person has to be taken care of within the network itself." Interestingly a significant number of respondents mention "loss of license," but only a few of them added that some form of state or national licensure is a prerequisite to this "version of disbarment." Perhaps the most thoughtful summary of suggestions came from a parttime, female (who offered the fact that she is 54 years old), employed by a health care organization. She asserts:

> There is little which can be done until we have developed

broader organization and parameters to the profession. Until licensing or certification (which can be revoked in cases of serious violations) is required to practice fund raising...and is mandated for employment, there are no penalties which can be evoked effectively.

****

Clearly the vast majority of fund raisers appear to favor some form of punishment for practitioners who willfully ignore established tenants of professional behavior. Unfortunately, there is little agreement on how a system of sanctions might be implemented, who should take the responsibility, and what disciplinary actions are warranted. It is a positive sign that fund raisers appreciate the importance of sanctions if ethical codes are to be meaningful. In this respect their professional attitudes conform to what experts on professionalization proclaim to be desireable. Given the structure of the fund raising field at present, however, it does not appear likely that broad scale efforts to implement enforcement mechanisms will be forthcoming in the near future.

Part III

Fund Raising as a Profession Revisited

This section of the monograph might appropriately carry the subtitle: What does it all mean?

Scholars who study professions make clear—in theory, at least—how so-called true professionals think and behave. The literature on professions describes the process by which occupations garner legal and/or public recognition as special kinds of work. These concepts about professionalization are also theoretical in nature, having been gleaned from evidence gathered over time by allegedly disinterested observers.

On the other hand, empirical data about a specific occupational group—in this case, fund raisers—provide a reasonable (but admittedly not exact) sense of how they think and behave as practitioners of their craft. This picture of real people discharging their fund raising responsibilities in real world settings must now be examined in light of the theoretical elements scholars provide.

Thus, it is fair to ask: What does it all mean? What does this exercise reveal about fund raising as a profession? What guidance is provided that will assist fund raisers and fund raising in the quest for professional stature and society's approbation? These are questions not easily answered, but the obligation to offer answers remains.

Just as Don Quixote's musical clone—the Man of LaMancha—sought to "reach that unreachable star," this analysis of professionalism aspires to a standard that cannot be reached. No professional group in modern society—not doctors, lawyers, the clergy, and not even their professors—reflects in any complete sense the ideal model of professional thinking and behavior which this analysis utilizes. To be sure, individual members of any professional group may typify the autonomous, theoretically astute, self-regulated, committed, altruistic, and ethical paragon. Collectively, however, no professional group actually reaches that star.

Given this reality, no one should be startled to learn that fund raising has not yet attained even the stature of some highly regarded, but imperfect, occupations. How far short of the mark is the fund raising field? In what categories of professionalism is it lacking? And further, what can be done about this situation?

An estimate of fund raising's current placement on the professional

continuum emerges from a reprise of data relevant to the six professional characteristics on which this study was based. To wit:

Autonomy. Fund raisers realize the importance of professional autonomy; they seek it, but the reality is that senior administrators and board members of employing organizations have the bottom line on most major decisions. The search for autonomy results in frequent job changes which are made possible by high demand for experienced practitioners. But there is hope. As fund raisers claim places in senior policy making bodies, greater autonomy is likely to be granted. This should reduce job hopping and foster understanding of the appropriate role of fund raisers in nonprofit organizations. Under these conditions, professional stature will undoubtedly increase.

Systematic Knowledge. The importance of theoretical principles to guide fund raising practice is widely accepted by fund raisers. Happily, there is evidence that this knowledge base is growing. Yet most fund raisers are convinced these principles are best learned on the job rather than through more formal preparation programs. This view is at variance with arrangements for training and induction of new members in other more advanced professions, and it creates a serious impediment to professionalization of the fund raising field. As research on philanthropy and nonprofit organizations continues to increase, however, so will the necessity of institutionalizing this new knowledge in more formal training programs. Higher professional stature for fund raisers will undoubtedly accompany this development.

Self-regulation. Well established professions, in particular law and medicine, have powerful national and state organizations that play leading roles in establishing regulatory mechanisms and standards of practice. Fund raising does not have this strong professionalizing influence and many fund raisers do not appear to appreciate its value. There is, however, considerable enthusiasm among fund raisers for some type of certification or licensure. Since putting in place a universal credentialing system will require unified action by the several organizations of fund raisers, this could foster greater self-regulation and collegial agreement on standards governing practice. Until movement in this area is evident, however, fund raising will not be cited as a sterling example of this professionalizing characteristic.

Commitment and Identification. Little evidence exists that fund raisers are committed to fund raising as a career or that they identify with it as a unique subculture. While many fund raisers appear willing to qualify for

a professional credential, nearly as many are not so willing to do so. Fund raising as a career ranks far below personal success and commitment to a cause or to employing organizations in the priorities of fund raising practitioners. Lack of commitment to their occupation tends to differentiate fund raisers from members of other professions that enjoy higher public acclaim. This is a strong deprofessionalizing influence since it limits motivation to form effective professional societies that control entry to the field and establish standards for competent and ethical practice. A massive shift in attitudes will be needed if fund raising as an occupational field is to gain strength in this important professionalizing characteristic. This is a task that requires creative and sustained attention by all existing organizations that claim fund raisers as members.

Altruism and Dedication to Service. Fund raisers extol service to others as their principle motivating force, but at the same time they rank salary and material rewards of their jobs as major incentives. The inconsistency of these views is both perplexing and understandable. It is likely that professionals in all other fields, with the possible exception of certain religious societies, are similarly of two minds in this regard. Whether views of other professionals diverge as sharply as do those of fund raisers is not known. If not, this suggests that a more even balance between altruism and self-interest may facilitate the movement of fund raising toward greater professional stature. Changing basic attitudes, particularly those of mature persons, is no easy task. It is, however, an important undertaking that usually begins with awareness of the fact that inconsistent attitudes are being expressed.

Ethics and Sanctions. It is a positive sign that most fund raisers understand the importance of ethical standards and the need for sanctions that put teeth in those standards. These views may have helped fuel recent sharpening of discussions about ethical issues in the fund raising field. It is one thing, to favor enforcement of ethical codes, but it is quite another thing to suggest realistic ways of doing so. Attention to enforcement methods appears to be a problem which requires attention by organizations of fund raisers, since several quite elaborate codes are in existence. The fact that there are "codes" instead of a single, universally accepted code of ethics poses a related problem. Quite possibly the professional stature of fund raising will rise in direct proportion to unanimity within the field about ethical practice and methods for dealing with practitioners who engage in questionable behavior.

****

Despite what some highly regarded fund raising practitioners assert, it must be concluded that *fund raising is not yet a profession.* At least, it is not among those few occupations that society generally recognizes as true professions, albeit true professions with warts and faults and problems. Evidence exists, however, supporting the contention that *fund raising is an emerging profession*—an occupation that has moved steadily along the professional continuum; an occupation with the potential to attain greater professional stature. Clearly much work needs to be done before this goal is reached, but there are forces at work in society which can facilitate the quest for professional stature. Consider, for example:

- the long-standing and deeply-held predisposition of Americans to give of their time and their resources to support worthy causes;
- the burgeoning interest in scholarship on philanthropy and voluntary action which yearly adds to the intellectual foundations of the fund raising field;
- the continued influx of bright, well-educated, and talented young people into fund raising positions;
- the introduction of philanthropy as a field of academic study at the undergraduate level in an impressive number of American colleges and universities;
- the development of graduate level courses and degree programs for preparation of nonprofit organization managers and staff members; and finally,
- the compelling reality that without continued, indeed ever increasing, private giving by individuals, foundations, and corporations, much of the necessary and worthwhile benevolent work of our society would not be accomplished.

In all candor, true professional status for fund raisers may be an "unreachable star," but greater professional stature is certainly possible. By reaching for that star, fund raisers can accelerate progress along the professional continuum and thus hasten fund raising's professional maturity.

Far from being an impossible dream, it is a quest of noble proportions. Fund raisers say they seek greater challenges. Their greatest professional challenge is to be found at the door of every development office. They need to pick up the challenge and do something about it.

Bibliography

Barone, M. (1983,May 18). Too Professional.*Washington Post*, p.A18.

Bartol, K. M. (1979). Professionalism as a Predictor of Organizational Commitment, Role Stress, and Turnover: A Multidimensional Approach. *Academy of Management Journal,22*,815-821.

Bledstein, B. J. (1976). *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and The Development of Higher Education in America*. New York: Norton.

Bullough, V. (1970). Education and Professionalism: A Historical Example. *Higher Education Quarterly,10*,160-69.

Carbone, R. F. (1985). *An Agenda for Research on Fundraising*. College Park, Maryland:Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising.

Carbone, R. F. (1987). *Fund Raisers of Academe*. College Park, Maryland: Clearinghouse for Research on Fund Raising.

Carbone, R. F. (1988a). A Professional Outlook.*CASE Currents,14(2)*,64.

Carbone, R. F. (1988b). The Meaning of Profession. *NSFRE Journal,13(1)*,26-27,41.

Etzioni, A. (Ed.). (1969). *The Semi-Professions and Their Organizations: Teachers, Nurses and Social Workers*. New York: Free Press.

Goode, W. J. (1969). The Theoretical Limits of Professionalization. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Semi-Professions and Their Organizations: Teachers, Nurses and Social Workers* (pp. 266-313). New York: Free Press.

Goodlad, S. (Ed.). (1984). *Education for the Professions*. Surrey, England:Society for Research into Higher Education.

Greenwood, E. (1957). Attributes of a Profession. *Social Work, 2(3)*, 45-55.

Hall, R. H. (1968). Professionalization and Bureaucratization. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 92-104.

Houle, C. O. (1981). *Continuing Education in the Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hughes, E. C. (1963). Professions. *Daedulus, 92(4)*,655-68.

Independent Sector. (1986). *Dimensions of the Independent Sector: A Statistical Profile*, (2nd ed.). Washington,D.C.: Author.

Kerr, S., Von Glinow, M. A., Schriesham, J. (1977). Issues in the Study of

'Professionals' in Organizations:The Case of Scientists and Engineers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 18,* 329-345.

Matassarin-Jacobs, E. (1985). *The Development of Professionalism: An Application to Nursing.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University.

Staff. (1988). Profile:1988 NSFRE Membership Career Survey. *NSFRE Journal, 13(3),*20-42.

Ritzer, G. & Walczak, D. (1986). *Working: Conflict and Change.* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Ritzer, G. & MacDonald, K. (1988). The Sociology of the Professions: Dead or Alive. *Work and Occupations,15 (3),*251-72.

Ritzer, G. & Walczak, D. (1988). Rationalization and the Deprofessionalization of Physicians. *Social Forces,67(1),*1-22.

Schein, E. H. (1972). *Professional Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schmidt, S. (1988, January 10). Bad Medicine: Doctors Rarely Lose Licenses. *Washington Post,* p.A1.

Schmidt, S. (1988,January 11), Bad Medicine: Panel has difficulty Determining Incompetence. *Washington Post,* p.A1.

Snizek, W. E. (1972). Hall's Professionalism Scale: An Empirical Reassessment. *American Sociological Review, 37(1),*109–13.

Stuart, J. (1982). *Individual Professionalism: An Analysis of Attitudes and Role Perceptions of Recreation Practititioners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Vendetti, M. (1985). *Chiropractic as a Profession: A Study of Professionalization Through Time.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University.

Vollmer, H. M. & Mills, D. L. (Eds.). (1966). *Professionalization.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Wilensky, H. J. (1964). The Professionalization of Everyone. *Journal of American Sociology, 70(2),*137–58.

Appendix A

Methodology of the Study

An earlier study of fund raisers employed by colleges and universities (Carbone, 1987) raised questions about the "sense of professionalism" exhibited by these development officers. Although the study's primary purpose was to describe demographic characteristics and career paths of college and university fund raisers, the data on professionalism suggested that:

> . . . fund raising for the benefit of academic institutions has not progressed very far along the continuum of professionalization. And it is unlikely that the fund raisers described . . . differ greatly from their counterparts who garner support for nonprofit organizations . . . (p. 15)

Upon reflection, the assertion about fund raisers ". . . who garner support for nonprofit organizations . . ." appeared to be unwarranted since the sample of fund raisers surveyed did not adequately represent all fund raisers employed by the nonprofit sector. The study reported in this monograph was designed to rectify that situation. It describes in both quantitative and qualitative terms professional attitudes and understandings of a large sample of fund raisers who hold membership in three national associations. Responses to the survey were received from fund raisers employed by nonprofit organizations concerned with cultural arts, medical and health care, social services, religious activities, as well as with colleges, universities, schools, and other charitable activities.

Population and Sample

It is estimated that the so-called "Third Sector"—nonprofit organizations—in the United States numbers more than one million entities. (Independent Sector) By definition, each of these organizations relies on charitable gifts to augment other sources of revenue. It is safe to assume, therefore, that the vast majority of them employ development officers who manage their fund raising programs. Membership information revealed that the three largest national associations of fund raisers—The National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE), The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), and The National Association for

Hospital Development (NAHD)—list more than 17,000 fund raisers as members. The executive officers of each association agreed to cooperate in the study by providing cover letters to potential respondents and by permitting access to their membership lists. Approximately ten percent of the membership of each association was included in a random sample of 1,750 potential respondents drawn by computer from the membership lists. The subjects were distributed among the associations as follows: NSFRE – 1,000 members; CASE – 500 members; NAHD – 250 members. (Note: The sample of CASE members includes only those who indicated on membership forms that their primary responsibility is fund raising, since the total membership of CASE includes significant numbers of alumni directors, publications personnel, and public/governmental relations officers.)

Survey Instrument

A search of the literature devoted to professions and the process of professionalization failed to produce an instrument deemed appropriate for this study. Studies identified in the search, however, provided helpful guidance in the creation of a new survey instrument. Hall's study of "professions and professionalizing occupations," reported in the American Sociological Review, utilized a lengthy instrument based on five "attitudinal attributes of professionalism." They are:

- Use of professional organizations as a major source of ideas and assistance in making professional judgments;
- Belief in self-regulation, judgment of the work of members by their peers, collegial control;
- Belief in service to the public and that the work per formed benefits both the public and the practitioner;
- A sense of calling to the field, dedication to the work;
- Autonomy in decision making without external pressure from clients, nonmembers, or employing organizations.

Subsequently Snizek analyzed Hall's instrument and reduced the number of items from 50 to approximately half that number based on item analysis. Bartol drew on the work of both Hall and Snizek in her "multidimensional approach" to studying professional behavior. Her instrument was based on five factors, namely:

- Autonomy—perceived right to make decisions about both the means and goals associated with one's work;
- Collegial maintenance of standards – belief that standards should be enforced by fellow professionals who are the only

ones properly equipped to evaluate the work;

- Ethics – felt responsibility to avoid self-interest and emotional involvement with clients in the course of rendering service, as well as dedication to high quality service to the client;
- Professional commitment – dedication to the work and long-term career aspirations in the field;
- Professional identification – use of the profession and fellow professionals as major referents.

Discussions by other authors of characteristics attributed to professionals were reviewed as well. Schein's "multiple criterion definition" of a profession included ten elements, while Houle offered no less than 14 "characteristics associated with the professionalization process." A compilation of all these lists yielded 21 attributes which I combined into six general elements:

- Autonomy of decision making about goals/objectives of the occupation and the way these goals/objectives are achieved;
- The body of systematic knowledge and skills basic to the field that are prerequisite to formal admission to practice of the occupation;
- Belief in self-regulation and collegial establishment and maintenance of standards;
- Commitment to the occupational group and identification with its values, standards, and typical modes of behavior;
- Altruism and the shared belief that the occupation is dedicated to service to clients and the general public as opposed to being driven by self-interest;
- Commitment to a code of ethics that governs behavior in the work of the occupation and that provides some basis for imposing sanctions on members of the occupational group who fail to abide by the code.

A new survey instrument based on these six elements was drafted and revised on the advice of several scholars familiar with the professionalization process and/or the field of fund raising. The instrument includes 18 items, three of which are directly relevant to each of the six elements (two forced choice items and one open ended item). A section requesting demographic information was added. Respondents were asked not to identify themselves. The survey instrument is found in Appendix B.

Data Collection and Analysis

Each of the 1,750 subjects received by mail a cover letter from the appropriate association executive, the survey instrument, and a selfaddressed, stamped return envelope. No follow-up was attempted. Usable responses were received from 754 subjects, approximately a 45 percent response rate. When sorted by association membership, NSFRE was slightly overrepresented, CASE was slightly underrepresented, and NAHD was significantly underrepresented. These facts notwithstanding, the sample and the respondents appear to broadly represent fund raisers in the nonprofit sector. Since the response rate was relatively small, however, and since no data was collected on nonrespondents, some caution is urged in interpretation of the findings. The University of Maryland Survey Research Center entered the data for computer analysis which was accomplished using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Appendix B

The Instrument

What Fund Raisers Think About Their Professional Status

Dear Fund Raiser:

You have been selected at random from a membership list for this study of fund raising as an important field of work. You can contribute to the body of knowledge about your chosen field by responding to the short survey that is attached. Please spend a few minutes doing it now.

The demographic information requested below will help in the analysis of the responses. Do not identify yourself, but please respond to each item.

Remember, your response is anonymous and your views are important in helping us understand more about fund raising. I am grateful for your cooperation.

Robert F. Carbone, Director

Type of *institution/organization* for which you work:

- ☐ College/university/school
- ☐ Cultural arts
- ☐ Medical/health care
- ☐ Social services
- ☐ Religious
- ☐ Other

What *percent* of your time do you give to these duties?

__% to annual fund activities
__% to major/capital gifts
__% to planned giving
__% to corporate/foundation gifts
__% to administrative and other non
100% fund raising tasks

How many *other fund raisers* work in the institution/organization for which you work?

- ☐ No other fund raisers
- ☐ 1 to 3 others
- ☐ 4 to 9 others
- ☐ 10 or more others

How many *years have you worked* as a volunteer or paid fund raiser?

Volunteer: __ years
Part-time but paid: __ years
Full-time: __ years

What is your highest level of *educational attainment?*

- ☐ High school diploma
- ☐ Bachelor's degree
- ☐ Master's degree
- ☐ Doctorate

Your gender

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Your Age Category

- ☐ Under 30
- ☐ 31 to 50
- ☐ Over 50

Each statement below is concerned with the professionalization of fund raising. For each statement below indicate

AT THE LEFT WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE
3 = Agree, 2 =Unsure, 1 = Disagree

and

AT THE RIGHT HOW IMPORTANT THE STATEMENT IS TO YOU
3 = important, 2 = Unsure, 1 = Unimportant

☐	1. The primary satisfaction felt by fund raisers is the knowledge that their work benefits the people served by the institutions/ organizations for which they work.	☐
☐	2. The body of knowledge and skills used by fund raisers in their work is based on general principles and theory organized in a systematic way.	☐
☐	3. Fund raisers are intimately aware of the code(s) of ethics in their field of work and almost without exception these standards guide the work that they do.	☐
☐	4. If fund raisers were required to qualify for some type of credential/certificate/license entitling them to enter or to continue practice, most of them would willingly do so.	☐
☐	5. The institutions/organizations that employ fund raisers accept almost without exception the judgements and decisions of fund raisers about the work that they do.	☐
☐	6. National organizations of fund raisers have played a leading role in setting standards and protecting the right of fund raisers to practice.	☐
☐	7. Special topic sessions at regional/national meetings or the short seminars/conferences on fund raising techniques provide sufficient training for newcomers just entering fund raising work.	☐
☐	8. Fund raisers who violate ethical standards established by national organizations are penalized by other fund raisers for these violations.	☐
☐	9. A credential/certificate/license for fund raisers indicates commitment to this field of work and helps to elevate the status and recognition of fund raising in the public mind.	☐
☐	10. Fund raisers generally have the freedom to exercise control over their own work time and to determine the activities in which they will engage as a fund raiser.	☐
☐	11. The competence of fund raisers and the quality of their work is best judged primarily be other fund raisers rather than by the institutional/organizational executives who employ them.	☐
☐	12. Fund raisers generally believe that their experience and their success in fund raising is a natural stepping stone to leadership positions in an institution/organization.	☐

13. What is the best way of training and inducting new members into the field of fund raising?

14. If you were offered a job in a field of work other than fund raising, what incentives would cause you to accept it?

15. What penalties would you assess for serious violations of the fund raising code(s) of ethics and how might this be done?

16. What important thing(s) might be done to raise the professional status of fund raising as a field of work?

17. Other than a steady increase in the number of fund raising positions in recent years, what best explains why many fund raisers make relatively frequent job changes?

18. Rank in order (high, medium, low) the relative priorities that fund raisers assign to the following:

☐ The institution or organization for which they work

☐ Personal success and advancement

☐ Fund raising as a field of work

Why do you think fund raisers have these priorities?

Thank you for responding.
Please use the stamped, self-addressed envelope to return your response

Appendix C

Responses of Fund Raisers to Forced-Choice Items

Characteristic: Autonomy of decision making about goals and ways of achieving them.

20% Agree 27% Unsure 53% Disagree	The institutions/organizations that employ fund raisers accept almost without exception their judgments and decisions about their work.	59% Important 33% Unsure 8% Unimportant
54% Agree 20% Unsure 26% Disagree	Fund raisers generally have the freedom to excercise control over their own work time and to determine the activities in which they will engage.	73% Important 22% Unsure 5% Unimportant

Characteristic: Attainment of a body of systematic knowledge and skills is prerequisite to entering practice.

62% Agree 21% Unsure 17% Disagree	The body of knowledge and skills used by fund raisers in their work is based on general principles and theory organized in a systematic way.	68% Important 24% Unsure 8% Unimportant
20% Agree 22% Unsure 58% Disagree	Special topic sessions at regional/national meetings or short seminars/conferences on fund raising techniques provide sufficient training for newcomers to fun raising work.	65% Important 27% Unsure 8% Unimportant

Characteristic: Belief in self-regulation and collegial establishment and maintenance of standards.

56% Agree 30% Unsure 14% Disagree	National organizations of fund raisers have played a leading role in setting standards and protecting the right to practice.	62% Important 28% Unsure 10% Unimportant
17% Agree 24% Unsure 59% Disagree	The competence of fund raisers and the quality of their work is best judged primarily by other fund raisers rather than executives who employ them.	34% Important 43% Unsure 23% Unimportant

Characteristic: Commitment to the occupational group and identification with its values, standards, and typical modes of behavior.

35% Agree 43% Unsure 22% Disagree	If fund raisers were required to qualify for some type of credential/certificate/license entitling them to enter or continue practice, most would willingly do so.	43% Important 37% Unsure 20% Unimportant
58% Agree 20% Unsure 22% Disagree	A credential/certificate/license for fund raisers indicates commitment to this field of work and helps elevate the status and recognition of fund raising in the public mind.	54% Important 27% Unsure 19% Unimportant

Characteristic: Altruism and the shared belief that the occupation is dedicated to serving clients and the general public as opposed to being driven by self interest.

87% Agree 10% Unsure 3% Disagree	The primary satisfaction felt by fund raisers is knowledge that their work benefits people served by the institution/organization for which they work.	91% Important 7% Unsure 2% Unimportant

39% Agree 36% Unsure 25% Disagree	Fund raisers generally believe that their experience and their success in fund raising is a natural stepping stone to leadership positions in an institution/organization.	37% Important 38% Unsure 25% Unimportant

Characteristic: A code of ethics that governs behavior in the work of the occupation plus sanctions for members who fail to abide by the code.

34% Agree 41% Unsure 25% Disagree	Fund raisers are intimately aware of the code(s) of ethics in their field and almost without exception these standards guide the work that they do.	87% Important 12% Unsure 1% Unimportant
5% Agree 37% Unsure 58% Disagree	Fund raisers who violate ethical standards established by national organizations are penalized for these violations by other fund raisers.	57% Important 33% Unsure 10% Unimportant